1 2	qta@kslaw.com KING & SPALDING LLP	MCGREGOR W. SCOTT (SBN 142413) nscott@kslaw.com KING & SPALDING LLP	
3	San Francisco, CA 94111	521 Capitol Mall, Suite 1500 Sacramento, CA 95814	
4	Telephone: +1 415 318 1214 Facsimile: +1 415 318 1300	Telephone: +1 916 321 4814	
5	K. LUAN TRAN (SBN 193808)		
6	ltran@kslaw.com MICHAEL D. ROTH (SBN 217464)		
7	mroth@kslaw.com JAMES A. UNGER (SBN 325115)		
8	junger@kslaw.com KING & SPALDING LLP 633 West Fifth Street, Suite 1600		
9	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: +1 213 443 4355		
10	Facsimile: +1 213 443 4310		
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff, Anh Lê		
12			
13	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
	STATE TO THE TOTAL	CO DIVISION	
16		CO DI VISION	
17	ANH LÊ,	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC	
17 18		Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	
17 18 19	ANH LÊ,	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC	
17 18 19 20	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO	
17 18 19 20 21	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, California; CITY AND COUNTY	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE	
17 18 19 20 21 22	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, California; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING IF DEFENDANTS	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, California; CITY AND COUNTY	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING IF DEFENDANTS	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, California; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING IF DEFENDANTS	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, California; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING IF DEFENDANTS	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, California; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING IF DEFENDANTS	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ANH LÊ, Plaintiff, v. CHESA BOUDIN, in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, California; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,	Case No. 3:22-cv-00477-JSC STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING IF DEFENDANTS	

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER

Case 3:22-cv-00477-JSC Document 26 Filed 02/25/22 Page 2 of 4

Plaintiff Anh Lê and Defendants Chesa Boudin and the City and County of San Francisco (collectively, the "Parties"), together through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate to an extension of the time for Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint. The current deadline is February 24, 2022. The Parties hereby stipulate to extend the deadline to March 1, 2022. This is the first extension of this deadline.

The Parties are currently working to avoid unnecessary motion practice. To facilitate their discussions without causing undue delay, the Parties further stipulate that, if Defendants respond to the Complaint with a motion to dismiss, it will be deemed served as of the date of service, but for the purposes of the briefing schedule, the motion shall be treated as if it were filed on the original due date of February 24, 2022. Accordingly, any opposition to the motion shall be filed by March 10, 2022, and any reply shall be filed by March 17, 2022, and the hearing on the motion shall be noticed for March 31, 2022.

For the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation is not intended to and will not prevent Plaintiff from exercising his right to amend his complaint, as a matter of course, within 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), if he chooses to do so. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B). The stipulated deadlines apply only if Defendants file a motion on March 1, 2022 and Plaintiff chooses to respond by opposing the motion.

1	DATED: February 24, 2022	By: /s/ Quyen L. Ta	
		Quyen L. Ta (SBN 229956) qta@kslaw.com	
2		KING & SPALDING LLP	
3		50 California Street, Suite 3300 San Francisco, CA 94111	
4		Telephone: +1 415 318 1214	
5		Facsimile: +1 415 318 1300	
		K. LUAN TRAN (SBN 193808)	
6		ltran@kslaw.com MICHAEL D. ROTH (SBN 217464)	
7		mroth@kslaw.com	
8		JAMES A. UNGER (SBN 325115) junger@kslaw.com	
9		KING & SPALDING LLP 633 West Fifth Street, Suite 1600	
9		Los Angeles, CA 90071	
10		Telephone: +1 213 443 4355 Facsimile: +1 213 443 4310	
11			
12		MCGREGOR W. SCOTT (SBN 142413) mscott@kslaw.com	
13		KING & SPALDING LLP 621 Capitol Mall, Suite 1500	
13		Sacramento, CA 95814	
14		Telephone: +1 916 321 4814	
15		Attorneys for Plaintiff, Anh Lê	
16			
17	Dated: February 24, 2022	By:/s/Jeremy M. Goldman	
18		Jeremy M. Goldman	
19		DAVID CHIU	
19		City Attorney	
20		WAYNE K. SNODGRASS JEREMY M. GOLDMAN	
21		JENNIFER E. CHOI	
22		Deputy City Attorneys	
		City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place	
23		San Francisco, California 94102-4682	
24		Attorneys for Defendants, CHESA BOUDIN,	
25		in his official capacity as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco and	
26		CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
27			
28			
		3	
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER		

[PROPOSED] ORDER PURSUANT TO THE PARTIES' STIPULATION: 1. Defendants' time to respond to the Complaint is extended to March 1, 2022. If Defendants file a motion to dismiss the Complaint, Plaintiff's opposition, if any, shall be due on March 10, 2022, and Defendants' reply, if any, shall be due on March 17, 2022. 3. The hearing on the motion shall be noticed for March 31, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: February <u>25</u>, 2022 United States Magistrate Judge